UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,489	12/22/2003	M. Charlotte Baltus	117428	2063

27074 7590 07/28/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
TSUI, WILSON W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/740,489	BALTUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 May 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20060418*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications: the amendment filed on 5/11/2006 to the application filed on: 12/22/2003, and IDS filed on 4/18/2006.

2. In the amendments, claims 1-16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 remain pending the application, and claims 1, 7, and 12 are independent claims.

3. Acknowledgement has been made to the amendments to the Specification, concerning the spelling correction for the word "accessed" in paragraph 0006, and thus the objection to the specification have been withdrawn.

4. Acknowledgement has been made to the amendments to the claims: 13, 14, 15, and 16, regarding the typographic error of "the processor of claim 12" which has been changed to "the system of claim 12", and thus, the objections to the claims have been withdrawn.

5. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

6. The rejection of claims 4, 5, 7-10, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been with drawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement filed 4/18/2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the Publication Identification Numbers for the Kanie et al, and Ullman et al references are not properly identified (incorrect US Application publication numbers). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits.

Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Objections

8. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

With regards to claim 7, there appears to be a typographical error, as the claim recites in part b): "... the information object most recently accessed *buy* the user", whereas, the examiner assumes the applicant instead intends to use the word "*by*".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regards to claim 1, the claim recites the limitation "the selected document" in line 6 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

With regards to claim 12, the claim recites the limitation "the selected document" in line 6 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3, 6, 12-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in further view of Lui et al (ACM, published: Year 2000, pages 512-519).

With regards to claim 1, Ball et al teaches a method for highlighting changes in an information object comprising:

- *Identifying a user*: Referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that "the invention maintains a table ... (along with) ... a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)". Thus, for a document-to-user mapping be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified.

- *Receiving a request from the user for a selected version of an information object*: (paragraph 0059: whereas, the external service receives the web page selection request from a user for a current version of a web page 'A'.)
- *In response to the request for the selected document, obtaining a most recent version of the information object as the selected version of the information object requested by the user* (paragraph 0059: whereas, the external service retrieves the most recent version of the information object requested by the user that is available from the storage of the external service (also described in paragraphs 0055, 0106)).
- *Obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying the user* (Previous version(s) of the page(s) requested by the identified user are stored together with subsequent changes as indicated in Fig 3, reference number 6 (paragraph 0055). Since the previous versions of the information object include all versions of the information object from the time the user expressed interest in it through a hot list, the previous versions that can be obtained also include *the previous version of the information object being a version of the information object most recently accessed by the user* through user selection as well (as taught through paragraphs 0048, 0055, 0056, and 0059).
- *Automatically determining a difference between the selected version of the information object and the previous version of the information object:* (To retrieve a previous version, along with the selected version of the information object; an

application is used to compare both versions and determine the differences between them (paragraph 0052: whereas, W3Newer is a preferred application to determine the differences between the two versions. Furthermore, the differences can be determined manually by the user, or automatically by means of default settings as explained in claim 9 of Ball et al).

- *Automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference*: A program used to automatically generate the rendering and highlighting to "generate an image shown in Fig 4" (paragraph 0059: output of rendered version is shown in the figure 4 screen shot) such that the image "represents changes, and contains material not present in the previous version of the page, but which has been added (paragraph 0061)". To highlight the changes, a "particular font, particular size, particular color, and particular background (paragraph 0061)" may be used.

However, even though Ball et al teaches obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying the user and *obtaining the previous version of the information object, the previous version being a version of the information object most recently accessed by the user* through user selection, the Office provides an additional reference (Liu et al), that teaches *obtaining the previous version of the information object, the previous version is the version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the user* through automatic computer selection/logic for the benefit of providing further evidence/facts. Furthermore, although Ball et al teaches *automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the*

difference, the Office provides an additional reference (Liu et al), that teaches a different method for *automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference*, for further the benefit of providing further evidence/facts.

Liu et al teaches *obtaining the previous version of the information object, the previous version is the version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the user* through automatic computer selection/logic (pages 514 and 515, P3-5, P3-6, and Figure 2: whereas, the previous version/old-cached-copy of the entire page or a part of the page that was most recently accessed/viewed by the user is accessed and a difference is computed.). In addition, Lui et al teaches *automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference* (page 517, P5-3: whereas, the user is automatically notified, and a rendered version of the information object (highlighting the difference) is automatically generated and sent to the user for viewing, as shown in Figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al's method for highlighting changes in an information object, to also further include Liu et al's method for obtaining the most recently accessed information object, and automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object, highlighting the difference. The combination of Ball et al and Liu et al would have allowed Ball et al to have "discovered and detected changes to the World Wide Web pages efficiently, and ... to have notified users of changes" (Liu et al, page 512, Abstract).

With regards to claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches a method further comprises, a*utomatically obtaining a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user*. Anytime there is a change in the original document/page, a new version number is generated (paragraph 0053-0054: whereas, it is described that "when changes are found, the invention stores them in the external service (computer/server)"). Furthermore, Ball et al's system keeps track of the last time a user has accessed a particular document/page (paragraph 0074: whereas, "as users access the pages, block 35 (of Fig 6) monitors the times of the accesses, in order to identify which versions of each page the user viewed last"). The tracking data is then used to obtain the version of the document/page that was most recently accessed by the user (paragraph 0076-0077: whereas, there are two versions described, such that version 1 is the document most recently accessed by the identified user, and version 2 is the up-to-date copy of the original. Bell et al's invention then obtains a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user since, at the time of access for the selected document/page, "the invention presents version 1, plus the changes which make version 2"). Additionally, Ball et al, and Liu et al also teach *automatically obtaining a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches a method further comprises, *displaying the rendered version of the information*: The rendered version of the information is rendered for display in a browser application (Figure 4:

whereas, changes are highlighted/marked in the document (in this case, highlights include italics, cross-outs, asterisks, and more) that were selected for access by the user and displayed in a browser application as shown in the screen shot)

With regards to claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al teaches *wherein the most recent version of the information object*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Furthermore, Ball et al also teaches *the most recent version of the information object that the user is authorized to access* (paragraph 0170: whereas, a system is used to authorize users, before information is sent to each user. Furthermore, as discussed in paragraph 0086, each hotlist (list of information items) are managed/authorized for each particular user).

With regards to claim 12, for a system performing a similar method as the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13, for a system performing a similar method as the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, for *outputting the rendered version to the display device*: Ball et al. inherently teaches that an output device is used to output a rendered version as a screen shot of the rendered version is provided for in Figure 4. Thus, for a user to see the output shown in Figure 4, an output device has been used to output the rendered version.

With regards to claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in further view of Lui et al (ACM, published: Year 2000, pages 512-519).

With regards to claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is shown through the use of an web browser). Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

With regards to claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, for *outputting the rendered version to a printing device*: Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that

changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is presented through the use of a web browser). Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) and Liu et al (ACM, published: Year 2000, pages 512-519) in further view of Warmus et al (US Patent Number: 6,952,801 B2, issued: Oct. 4, 2005, filed: May 10, 2001)

With respect to claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. does not teach *encoding information on the stored information in glyphs such that the encoded information designates the version of the information object*.

Warmus et al. however, teaches *encoding information on the stored information in glyphs such that the encoded information designates the version of the information object* (Warmus et al., column 3, lines 60-62: whereas, "the step of specifying page description language instructions to produce a barcode on the page. The barcode may be indicative of tracking information").

Furthermore, Ball et al., Lui et al, and Warmus et al. are from the same problem solving area: Document processing.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al, and Lui et al's storage of page content to further include metadata for the creation of a barcode to identify the information object's version as taught by Warmus et al. The combination of Ball et al, Lui et al, and Warmus et al. would have allowed Ball et al's version tracking system to be used outside of electronic form so users would have been able to identify and differentiate between different versions of hardcopies.

13. Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) and Liu et al (ACM, published: Year 2000, pages 512-519) in further view of Jeffery et al. (US Patent Number: 6,957,384 B2, Issued: Oct. 18, 2005, filed: Dec. 27, 2000).

With regards to claim 7, Ball et al. and Lui et al teach an apparatus that highlights changes in an information object comprising:

- *A processor that, in response to the request, retrieves a most recent version of the information object as the selected information object, and a previous version of the information object, the previous version being obtained based on the identification of the user and being a version of the information object most recently accessed by the user*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *A delta determination device that automatically determines a difference between the selected version and the previous version*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *A renderer that automatically generates a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

In addition, Ball et al's external service teaches *identifying a user* as by referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that "the invention maintains a table ... (along with) ... a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)". Thus, for a document-to-user mapping be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified. Furthermore, Ball et al teaches *a request for retrieving a selected information object*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of

claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Yet, Ball et al does not expressly teach *a query interface that receives a user identification and request for a selected information object.*

Jeffery et al however, teaches *a query interface that receives user identification* (Figure 24: whereas, an interface is shown and a form is used to query the user for a login ID) *and request data for a selected information object* (Figure 7-1, column 10, lines 2-5: whereas, an interface is shown such that a user is able to click on (select) a specific contract number to request data for that particular contract/information object and "contracts may be displayed and accessed").

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al's user identification routine to further include the query interface for user identification and information object data request as taught by Jeffery et al. The combination of Ball et al, Liu et al, and Jeffery et al, would have helped Ball et al's invention to "provide a method for storing, organizing and providing remote electronic access to documents" (Jeffery et al, column 2, lines 24-26).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Ball et al teaches *wherein the most current version of the information object is automatically retrieved as the selected information object user* (paragraph 0059: whereas, the external service retrieves the most recent version of the information object requested by the user (automatically without having the user manually locate and retrieve the information object) that is available from the storage of the external service (also described in paragraphs 0055, 0106)).

With regards to claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Ball et al teaches *wherein the previous version is automatically selected as a version that was most recently accessed by the user*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale. Furthermore Ball et al and Liu also teach *wherein the previous version is automatically selected as a version that was most recently accessed by the user*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, Ball et al teaches:

- *At least one database that stores the current version and the previous version* (Ball et al, paragraph 0130: whereas, an application called NO HANDS, is used by the external service to help provide users with a way to organize, retrieve, and view differences between pages. Since NO HANDS provides for a collection of information organized in such a way to aid users or a computer program to more efficiently select pieces of data; NO HANDS implements a database). Furthermore, NO HANDS is used to help present the differences between the current and previous versions that are stored in the external service. (paragraph 0131: through one of NO HANDS' tools called Htmldiff).
- *An output device that outputs the rendered version*: Ball et al inherently teaches that an output device is used to output a rendered version as a screen shot of the rendered version is provided for in Figure 4. Thus, for a user to see the output shown in Figure 4, an output device has been used to output the rendered version.

With regards to claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is presented through the use of a web browser). Therefore, Ball et al. inherently teaches *a display is used as an output device* in order for the user to view the screen shot of figure 4. Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

15. Applicant amended claims 1, 7, and 12. With regards to claims 1, 7, and 12, the applicant is requiring 'obtaining a most recent version of the information object as the

selected version of the information object requested by the user' and argues that the most recent version has to come from a specified actual source (or in Ball et al's terminology: the Repository). Yet the claim only requires "obtaining a most recent version of the information object as the selected version of the information object requested by the user", not a specified source/Repository for which the most recent version must be obtained; thus, the applicant's arguments are not persuasive, since Ball et al does in fact retrieve the most recent version available from the External Service. Additionally with regards to claim 1, 7, and 12, the Applicant is arguing automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference with respect to the independence of manual user selection of the information object (Page 10 of Applicant's Remarks: "a user (must) manually initiate a comparison between a selected document and a past version". Yet, the claim only requires "automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference", and does not require the automatic outputting to be independent with respect to manual user selection for comparing a selected document and past (most recently accessed) version), and thus, the applicant's arguments are considered not persuasive, since Ball et al teaches the output is rendered automatically with respect to the rendering and the highlighting-differencing process (since the user plays no role in the process for generating the output image and highlighting). See the rejection for claims 1, 7, and 12, for further details/explanations with regards to the other amendments that the applicant has made for claims 1, 7, and 12.

16. Furthermore, under previous headings 35 U.S.C 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (with respect to claims 2, 3, 6, 13, 14, and 16), 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ball (with respect to claims 4 and 15), 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ball in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,952,801 to Warmus et al (with respect to claim 5), and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ball in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,384 to Jeffery et al. (with respect to claims 6-11), Applicant's argument for the non-amended claims that depend on either one of the independent claims 1, 7, and 12, are rendered moot, as the Examiner has shown these independent claims to be rejected.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W. T. 7/12/06

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
July 12, 2006

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER